

### **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

#### **Summary of Substance of Interview**

This is a summary of the telephone interview of August 23, 2010 between Examiners Rolland and Cleveland, and Applicant's representative. This summary is being filed with reply to the last Office Action and thus is timely filed.

Applicants' representative and the Examiners discussed the claim construction and possible claim amendments to overcome the obviousness rejections. Applicants' representative and the Examiners also discussed the disclosures of the cited prior art.

#### **Claim Amendments**

Claims 19, 29, 37-38 and 40 have been amended to clarify the language. There is written description support for this amendment in the specification as filed at least at Figure 1. No new matter is added.

New claims 52-53 have been added. There is written description support in the specification as filed at least at p. 8, paras. 3-4. No new matter is added.

New claim 54, directed to a method of production of a multilayered strip, has been added. There is written description support in the specification as filed at least at p. 2, para. 4 through p. 3, paras. 1-2. No new matter is added.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 29, 33-34, 39-40 and 47-51 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Kaplan (US Patent No. 2,850,999) in view of Levendusky (US Patent No. 5,919,517) and further in view of Goldsworthy (US Patent No. 4,402,778). Kaplan is directed to the treatment of coated metal sheets which may be used for decorative purposes. Levendusky is directed to a method for extrusion coating a metal strip. Goldsworthy is directed to a method for the continuous high speed production of reinforced plastic flat sheet structures. The Examiner argues that Kaplan discloses all of the claim elements except for the step for extrusion coating with plastic or the limitation relating to dimensional stability. The Examiner then cites Levendusky for its teaching of extrusion coating and Goldsworthy for its teaching of plastic sheet structures, and argues that one of skill in the art would have combined the teachings from these three cited references to arrive at the presently claimed subject matter. However, contrary to the Examiner's argument, Kaplan does not disclose a thin metal strip which is embossed and then coated. Rather, Kaplan discloses a metal strip which is coated first and then embossed (col. 2, ll. 70-72 through col. 3, ll. 1-2, and Fig. 4). Coating the metal strip in this way provides the advantage of "substantially better adherence between the coating and the metal" (col. 4, ll. 53-55). Thus, one of skill in the art would likely not be motivated to coat the metal strip again by combining the teachings of Kaplan and Levendusky. Further, the teachings of Kaplan and Levendusky

are not combinable as suggested by the Examiner. Levendusky does not disclose a metal strip with an upper face that has a structure in the form of a three dimensional relief. Levendusky also does not disclose that the reinforcement layer is extrusion coated on the upper embossed layer. To the contrary, Levendusky discloses that the metal strip (150) is not embossed (Fig. 5 and col. 7, ll. 29-41), and that the surface of the coating should be "smooth and glossy" and have a "minimum of irregularities" (col. 15, ll. 5-11). Therefore, the teachings of Levendusky, which require a non-embossed metal strip, cannot be combined with the teachings of Kaplan, which require an embossed metal strip. Goldsworthy does not cure this deficiency. As such, the teachings of Kaplan, Levendusky and Goldsworthy cannot be combined to render obvious the presently claimed subject matter.

The Examiner has rejected claims 31, 32, 35 and 36 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Kaplan (US Patent No. 2,850,999) in view of Levendusky (US Patent No. 5,919,517) and further in view of Goldsworthy (US Patent No. 4,402,778) and various other references. The Examiner has cited the other references in support of his rejection of dependent claim limitations. However, none of these other references remedy the deficiencies, discussed above, of Kaplan and Levendusky, and thus the obviousness rejection of these claims also cannot be maintained.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding Office Action rejections. Early and favorable action is awaited. The Director is authorized to charge any fees or overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2135.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Carolyn L. Greene/  
Carolyn L. Greene  
Registration No. 57,784  
Attorney for Applicant  
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, PC  
Suite 800, 1425 K. Street  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 783-6040

RBM/CG